

DIAMOND X RANCH LLC,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY,  
Defendant.

**re: Doc. # 111**

Disclosure of Experts: **January 15, 2016**

Disclosure of Rebuttal Experts: **March 18, 2016**

Expert Discovery Deadline: **May 16, 2016**

Dispositive Motions Deadline: **July 15, 2016**

Joint Pretrial Order: **August 16, 2016.**

If a dispositive motion is filed, the Joint Pre-Trial Order shall be due **thirty (30)** days after a decision on the dispositive motion.

Disputed Extensions: Amending the Pleadings or Adding Parties

As discussed above, the parties dispute whether the court should modify the deadlines for amending the pleadings or adding parties. In view of the unique nature of this case, the various motions which are pending (see, e.g., Docs. ## 76, 87, 97, and the parties' "notices at Docs. ## 109 and 110), the lack of prejudice to Atlantic Richfield (which has yet to file an answer and/or counterclaim (if any) to Plaintiff's complaint), the court finds that there is good cause to also amend the deadlines for amending the pleadings or to add parties.<sup>1</sup>

At the last status conference, after discussing the complicated procedural status of this case, the court stated it "recognizes further modification to the scheduling order may be necessary." (Doc. # 108.) The court made specific reference to the outstanding motion for leave to amend (Doc. # 97) which may very well impact the outstanding motion to dismiss (Doc # 87). *Id.*

Therefore, the court concurs with Plaintiff that a new deadline for amending the pleadings or adding parties should be adopted and any motions to effect such amendments, shall be made by **November 6, 2015.**<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: June 30, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM G. COBB  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> As Diamond points out, it is "not currently moving the amend its complaint, but is seeking to "preserve" its right to do so pending a favorable disposition of its recently-filed water rights claim with the Water Master. (Doc. # 113 at 3.)

<sup>2</sup> The court further observes, however, that additional amendments or revisions to the scheduling order will likely be sought by one or both of the parties. The court is not prejudging those possible amendments but just commenting on the inevitability of them.